### 1-Contractors T

A. Interpretation: The aff must defend that just governments require that all employers nationwide pay a living wage.

A living wage can be applied nationally for all workers.

**Pollin 7** Robert Pollin (American economist. He is a professor of economics at the University of Massachusetts Amherst and founding co-director of its Political Economy Research Institute). “Making the Federal Minimum Wage a Living Wage.” New Labor Forum. Spring 2007. http://www.peri.umass.edu/fileadmin/pdf/other\_publication\_types/Pollin\_May\_2007\_NLF\_Column--Making\_Federal\_Min\_Wage\_a\_Living\_Wage.pdf

Lawrence Glickman’s 1997 book A Living Wage: American Workers and the Making of Consumer Society provides a good working definition of the term **living wage**: “It **is a wage** level **that offers workers the ability to support families to maintain self respect and** to have both the means and the leisure to **participate in** the **civic life** of the nation” (p. 66). How can we translate Glickman’s definition into dollars and cents, as we obviously must if living wages are to operate as a workable policy tool? When the modern living wage movement began in the mid-1990s, the approach that organizers took was to tie the living wage standard to the federal government’s official poverty line. They set the living wage at least high enough to enable a full-time worker to maintain his or her family above the official poverty line. But we confront an immediate problem with this approach, which is that the poverty line in the United States is seriously deficient. This is because it is calculated using an outdated approach which does not reflect the actual costs of providing for basic necessities other than food, including housing, health care, and child care. The poverty benchmarks also take no account of regional differences in the cost of living. As an average for the country, it is widely recognized among researchers that the official poverty benchmark for the country is probably about 40 to 50 percent too low. In high-cost urban areas such as Boston or Los Angeles, that figure should rise by roughly an additional 25 percent. **If we work with a revised poverty threshold at 140 percent of the official level, a national living wage standard** in 2009 tied to such a poverty line **would be about $11.50** an hour for a single mother with two children, working fulltime, with no vacation and no health care. In high cost areas, the figure would rise to about $14.40 an hour. But **poverty thresholds need not be the only benchmark** for defining a living wage. Glickman’s definition certainly suggests a more generous approach. As one outgrowth of the living wage movement, **researchers have recently developed** estimates of what they term “basic budget” or **“basic needs” standards for communities throughout the country**. These figures provide what researchers at the Economic Policy Institute call a “realistic picture of how much income it takes for a safe and decent standard of living.” Drawing from the Economic Policy Institute’s basic budget estimates, a living wage standard in 2009 for the same single mother with two children, working fulltime, would be about $17.50 an hour in Lincoln, Nebraska, and $31.60 in Boston.

B. Violation: they defend only ordinances for city contractors.

C. Standards:

1. Textual accuracy. “Governments” represent the whole nation not specific municipalities.

**Random House** Random House Dictionary. “Government.” Dictionary.com. No date. http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/government

4. **a branch or service of the supreme authority of a state or nation,** taken as **representing the whole: “a dam built by the government”**

Random house is the best definition since it’s from dictionary.com and most predictable so most people would know to abide by your offense.

Also, living wage can be either contractors or federally implemented.

RTMW 11 “Minimum Wage Question and Answer” June 3rd 2011 Raise the Minimum Wage http://www.raisetheminimumwage.com/pages/qanda

What’s the difference between the minimum wage and a living wage? It is generally understood that the minimum wage – even in states with higher-than-federal rates - is inadequate to support a family of any size. As a result, the concept of a “living wage” has gained popularity, as advocates, academics, and policymakers have explored other ways of defining a wage level adequate to support a decent standard of living in America. Examples of these alternative standards include the Economic Policy Institute’s “Family Budget Calculator,” which compile the costs of essentials such as housing, food, child care, transportation and health care in different regions of the country and different family sizes to estimate the income required for families to meet basic needs at a minimally adequate level. The term “living wage” has also come to describe local ordinances that require employers that benefit from publicly funded service contracts and/or economic development subsidies to pay higher wages and/or offer health care coverage to their employees. Generally, living wage ordinances require wages that are significantly higher than federal or state minimum wages – typically $10.00-$14.00 an hour (sometimes set at the poverty level for a family of 4). After years of grassroots advocacy starting in the early 1990s, more than 120 cities across the nation currently have living wage laws. NELP has compiled a list of these ordinances and their provisions here.

The whole sentence determines a word’s context.

**Dolley 84** Steven D. Dolley, Nuclear Control Institute's research director, former Debate Coach at Bates College and the University of Vermont, where “Topicality: Is it Reasonable to be Reasonable”, 1984—Waging War on Poverty, http://groups.wfu.edu/debate/MiscSites/ DRGArticles/Dolley1984Poverty.htm

A second determinant of context in the sentence is grammar. Many **words serve different** grammatical **functions in different situations**, and their **meaning shifts drastically** from one context to another. The work "all" is illustrative. When used as an adjective, it means "the whole amount or Quantity of,"21 as we are well aware. When a knife-wielding felon says, "Give me all your money," you had best hand over the entirety of your cash if you wish to acknowledge the literal meaning of his statement and avoid internal bleeding. However, "all" works quite differently when it becomes an adverb, meaning in that situation "entirely; totally; altogether."22 To eat all-beef patties does not mean to gorge oneself on every burger in the world, and to be voted All-American does not transform a quarterback into every US citizen. To define a word being used as one part of speech when it is being used as another renders the word less than useless. Third, the syntactical structure of the sentence must be accounted for. Some words have different definitions in different types of sentences. The word "any" is one such word, as college debaters learned a few years ago. Zeno Vendler, a logician at Cornell University, used the example of a basket of apples and the statement "Take any." Here the syntactical context is permissive, and as Vendler stressed, "any" cannot mean "all": I said, 'Take any.' Do you want to suggest that short of taking all you did not accept the offer? No, I say, taking all would be an abuse of it. Your requirement of completeness clashes, once more, with the freedom of choice of 'any..'23 If the sentence were altered to make it prohibitive rather than permissive, it would read "Do not take any." Here, "any's" function would be similar to "all" i.e., all apples are denied to you. **Debaters must be cautious when dealing with** these **subtle but significant shifts in meaning**. Often extensive research in dictionaries, encyclopedias, compilations of legal definitions such as Words and Phrases, and grammar texts will be necessary. An affirmative relying on first glance impressions, or gut feelings about what the framers must have meant, will drop many topicality ballots to a team that has methodically explored the implications of the resolution's syntax.

This means the living wage definition debate is a wash-we resolve the debate using the word “governments” which indicates you are not topical.

2. Topic literature. There aren’t a lot of studies about local living wage ordinances.

**Fairris et al 5** David Fairris et al 05 Department of Economics, UC Riverside and David Runsten North American Integration and Development Center, UCLA Carolina Briones and Los Angeles Alliance for a New Economy and Jessica Goodheart Los Angeles Alliance for a New Economy, “Examining The Evidence The Impact of the Los Angeles Living Wage Ordinance on Workers and Businesses”, UCLA, 2005

Local governments are increasingly turning to living wage policies as a means to improve job quality for low-income workers. To date, more than 100 local governments around the country have passed living wage ordinances. Living wage laws set wage and benefit standards for workers employed by government contractors or other firms that have a financial relationship with the government. These laws have, in part, been a response to the stagnation of state and federal minimum wages, which have failed to keep pace with inflation. In addition, these laws represent a reaction to the growing interest in contracting out city services as a means to cut costs, a strategy that advocates argue penalizes the low wage workers who perform city services. However, **despite** the prominence and **continued growth in** the number of **living wage ordinances, only a handful of** retrospective **studies** of firms **have been published on the impacts of these laws**. This study is the first to combine a random sample survey of affected firms and workers, a control group analysis of low-wage employers, and a matched firm and worker dataset. These elements make us confident that our survey results both isolate the effects of the living wage and accurately represent the experiences of living wage workers and firms.” (6)

There is shitload of literature on federal minimum wage hikes though, googling things confirms-almost every study about poverty and unemployment is about the federal minimum wage. Topic lit is key to fairness and education because if the aff is outside of the lit I can’t engage with it.

D. Voters. 1. Vote on fairness, cross apply the aff warrants. 2. Jurisdiction is a voter since if the aff isn’t topical it’s out of your jurisdiction to vote on it and you should default neg as I’m the only one with an advocacy. This also implies you evaluate T before theory since jurisdiction is the most important voter.

Drop the debater on T: 1. Drop the arg is severance from the position of the 1AC-you can just read new arguments in the 1AR or connect parts of the aff to whole res which is equivalent to kicking the aff and reading a new plan in the 1AR-skews my strat since I don’t know what you’ll argue for. 2. Drop the arg discourages the neg from reading T to check back abusive affs since they will lose the portion of the 1nc they spent arguing T, making it more strategic to let the aff get away with their non-topical affs which kills fairness and education since affs will get away with sketchy positions. 3. I had to spend time reading T to check back abuse-dropping the arg means a portion of my 1nc is moot which kills fairness and education.

Competing interps since 1. Any brightline is arbitrary and bites judge intervention 2. Reasonability causes a race to the bottom to see who can be the most abusive under the given brightline 3. Competing interps forces a race to the top-an offense defense paradigm fosters good norms for the activity.

No RVIs. 1. Illogical. Just because you are fair doesn’t mean you should win. If that were true, both debaters would win rounds without theory, which would be irresolvable, and resolvability comes first since every debate needs a winner. 2. Chilling effect. Either I read theory and you beat me with your 4 minute prep out or I don’t read theory and abusive practices prevail-both kill fairness.

### 2-Recruitment DA

Military recruitment is increasing in the squo because the job seems attractive.

Alvarez 9 Lizette Alvarez (Miami bureau chief for The New York Times since January 2011) “More Americans Joining Military as Jobs Dwindle” January 18th 2009 The New York Times <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/01/19/us/19recruits.html?pagewanted=all> JW 1/1/15

As the number of jobs across the nation dwindles, more Americans are joining the military, lured by a steady paycheck, benefits and training. The last fiscal year was a banner one for the military, with all active-duty and reserve forces meeting or exceeding their recruitment goals for the first time since 2004, the year that violence in Iraq intensified drastically, Pentagon officials said. And the trend seems to be accelerating. The Army exceeded its targets each month for October, November and December — the first quarter of the new fiscal year — bringing in 21,443 [thousand] new soldiers on active duty and in the reserves. December figures were released last week. Recruiters also report that more people are inquiring about joining the military, a trend that could further bolster the ranks. Of the four armed services, the Army has faced the toughest recruiting challenge in recent years because of high casualty rates in Iraq and long deployments overseas. Recruitment is also strong for the Army National Guard, according to Pentagon figures. The Guard tends to draw older people. “When the economy slackens and unemployment rises and jobs become more scarce in civilian society, recruiting is less challenging,” said Curtis Gilroy, the director of accession policy for the Department of Defense.

People will be less likely to join the military if civilian pay is higher.

**VanFossen 2k** Phillip VanFossen (former high school and middle school economics teacher and coach, He was there at the beginning of EconEdLink, having written the first NetNewsLine lesson for the site. He has served as the Review Board Chair since 1999. He currently serves as the James F. Ackerman Professor of Social Studies Education, Director of the Ackerman Center for Democratic Citizenship at Purdue University, and Associate Director of the Purdue Center for Economic Education. He also currently serves as Interim Head of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at Purdue. His research interest is in how classroom teachers apply digital technology in their teaching. He has published widely in the area and in economic education generally. In addition, Phillip has traveled on more than 15 trips to half a dozen nations (primarily in Eastern Europe) to conduct economic education seminars). “‘Be All You Can Be’...For Minimum Wage?” Econ Ed Link. March 23rd, 2000. http://www.econedlink.org/lessons/index.php?lid=94&type=educator

As we might have expected, more young men and women were in the military service in 1980 (at the end of the draft) than were serving in 1999 (nearly 20 years after the end of compulsory service). However, the greatest percentage decrease in service personnel took place from 1990 to 1995, more than 10 years after the end of the compulsory service requirement. It looks as if some other factors may account for the dramatic drop-off in the number of military personnel in service. What might some of these factors be? [Budget cuts, low pay, military no longer seen as an attractive career, post-Viet Nam attitude changes, post-Desert Storm cutbacks.] Robert **Schlesinger has an economic explanation for** this mystery in his article "Army Reserve Battling an Exodus ." What does Schlesinger say are the **main causes of** this mass **exodus of military personnel**? [ (a) Tight labor markets--U.S. prosperity means that most everyone has a job, and low-paying industries like fast food restaurants are forced to pay more than minimum wage to attract workers; (b) lack of prestige to military service; (c) mostly due to low wages **relative to other, less dangerous occupations**, the base pay of a private in the U.S. Army is about the same as starting wages at fast food restaurants.] armyLet's test Schlesinger's theory by comparing the base salary of a private in the U.S. Army with what the same person might make earning the minimum wage in the civilian world. Currently the minimum wage in the United States is $5.15/hour. If our civilian worker is working 40 hours per week over 50 weeks then how much would he or she earn in a year? [$5.15/hr. X 40 hrs./week X 50 weeks = $10,300] What does a private earn per year? Log on to the military monthly base pay table, Basic Military Pay . Assume that our private (rank rating of E-1) has less than two years experience. What is her annual salary? [$12,060] Using a 2000 hour work year (as we did above), what is her hourly wage? [$6.03] So the private, who is risking her life for her country, is making $.88 an hour more than the civilian burger flipper! In order to compete, the Army (and the other branches of service) must use other, non-salary incentives to attract personnel. What might some of these incentives be? [College tuition, enlistment bonuses, housing and food allowances.] Log on to the Army's Recruitment Page to find several examples of these incentives. Let's look at how one of these incentives, the housing allowance, contributes to our private's income. Using the Army's Basic Allowance for Housing Database , chose your private's rank and state. What is the monthly housing allowance? [Answers will vary depending on location, but should be in the range of $425/month for a single soldier, $550/month for a soldier with dependents.] Adding this monthly allowance to the private's salary means an annual income of how much? [Approximately $17,160 for the single soldier; $18,660 for the solider with dependents.] **With** this **additional income, our private is** now clearly **making more than the minimum wage worker**, but is it enough to get by? To learn more about the financial strain some military families experience read Feeling the Pinch of a Marine Salary . Is it possible that, even with housing and food allowances, many U.S. soldiers and sailors are--as the previous article implies-- living in poverty? If our private were the only breadwinner for her family of four (herself and three dependents), what is the US Census Bureau's Poverty Threshold ? [$16,954] Is our private 'living in poverty'? [Clearly no, but she's not too far removed...her income is only $1,700 above the poverty threshold for a family of four with three dependents and she's risking her life for her country...!] **Two basic tenets of economic behavior are that every decision has a cost** (Economic Content Standard 1 ) **and that people respond to incentives** (Economic Content Standard 4 ). **If U.S. citizens chose to join the military, they 'trade-off'** the possibility of **other** (perhaps more lucrative) **forms of employment. If the choice is between a potentially dangerous career in the military**, then, **or a safer, more stable civilian career where the pay is better, rational people will choose the latter**. It would seem that Congress, the president and the nation's military leadership have recognized these issues (as well as the severity of this most recent labor shortage), as recent legislation has been passed that gives military personnel the largest pay raise (4.8%) since 1981. Perhaps those who are trying to "Be All They Can Be" can do so on a bit more than minimum wage. The article Military Pay Raise Gap does a nice job of exemplifying this dilemma.

Living wage makes maintaining the military nearly impossible.

Maki 14 (has been involved in the peace, labor, civil rights, and environmental movements for over 30 years) Alan L. Maki “Minimum Wage and the Military in Minnesota” Selecting Stones August 12th 2014 <http://selectingstones.com/2014/08/12/minimum-wage-and-the-military-in-minnesota/> JW 2/20/15

People like to say that we have no more draft in America. Politicians have learned the way to avoid a draft is to keep working class youth very poor — one of the reasons they refuse to raise the minimum wage to a real living wage, though nobody seems to want to talk about this. Most young people, if they had a job, and if the job paid real living wages, would never think of “volunteering” for the military. The United States has a draft, an economic draft. Maintaining the legal minimum wage as a poverty wage is a part of this draft. Military recruiters concoct any lie they can think of to hoodwink young people into joining the military, but the main lie they spread concerns how economically well off they will supposedly be when — never mentioning if — they get back. The situation is even more difficult for youth of color, who have an even more difficult time finding employment because of racist discrimination. For Native American youth, trapped in the racist unemployment of reservation life, this is even more of an issue. The fact is, and anyone can think about this, it would be nearly impossible for the United States government to maintain a military if everyone who wants a job had a job paying real living wages. In Minnesota, one union that was a big pusher for the $9.50/hour minimum wage law, the United Food and Commercial Workers, actually allows young people to come into the stores that it has organized, and to bag and carry out groceries solely for “tips”. The military recruiters actually come into these stores to harass these youth as they are trying to scrape together a few dollars.

Military readiness is key to prevent multiple nuclear conflicts.

**O’Hanlon and Kagan 7** Michael O’Hanlon, Senior Fellow and Sydney Stein Jr. Chair in Foreign Policy Studies at the Brookings Institution and Frederick Kagan, Resident Scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, and “The Case for Larger Ground Forces”, Stanley Foundation Report, April, http://stanleyfoundation.org/publications/other/Kagan\_OHanlon\_07.pdf

We live at a time when wars not only rage in nearly every region but threaten to erupt in many places where the current relative calm is tenuous. To view this as a strategic military challenge for the United States is not to espouse a specific theory of America’s role in the world or a certain political philosophy. Such an assessment flows directly from the basic bipartisan view of American foreign policy makers since World War II that overseas **threats must be countered before they** can directly **threaten** this country’s shores, that the basic stability of **the international system** is essential to American peace and prosperity, and that **no country besides the U**nited **S**tates **is in a position to lead the way** in countering major challenges to the global order. Let us highlight the **threats** and their consequences with a few concrete examples, emphasizing those that **involve key strategic regions** of the world such as the Persian Gulf and East Asia, **or** key potential threats to American security, such as the **spread of nuclear weapons** and the strengthening of the global Al Qaeda/jihadist movement. The Iranian government has rejected a series of international demands to halt its efforts at enriching uranium and submit to international inspections. What will happen if the US—or Israeli—government becomes convinced that **Tehran is on the verge** of fielding a nuclear weapon? **North Korea**, of course, **has already done so**, and the ripple effects are beginning to spread. Japan’s recent election to supreme power of a leader who has promised to rewrite that country’s constitution to support increased armed forces—and, possibly, even nuclear weapons— may well alter the delicate balance of fear in Northeast Asia fundamentally and rapidly. Also, in the background, at least for now, Sino- **Taiwan**ese **tensions continue to flare, as do tensions between India and Pakistan**, Pakistan and Afghanistan, Venezuela and the United States, and so on. Meanwhile, the world’s nonintervention in Darfur troubles consciences from Europe to America’s Bible Belt to its bastions of liberalism, yet with no serious international forces on offer, the bloodletting will probably, tragically, continue unabated. And as bad as things are in Iraq today, they could get worse. What would happen if the key Shiite figure, Ali al Sistani, were to die? If another major attack on the scale of the Golden Mosque bombing hit either side (or, perhaps, both sides at the same time)? Such deterioration might convince many Americans that the war there truly was lost—but the costs of reaching such a conclusion would be enormous. Afghanistan is somewhat more stable for the moment, although a major Taliban offensive appears to be in the offing. Sound US grand strategy must proceed from the recognition that, over the next few years and decades, the world is going to be a very unsettled and quite dangerous place, with Al Qaeda and its associated groups as a subset of a much larger set of worries. **The only** serious **response** to this international environment **is to develop armed forces capable of protecting** America’s **vital interests** throughout this dangerous time. **Doing so requires a military capable of a wide range of missions—including** not only **deterrence of great power conflict in** dealing with potential **hotspots** in Korea, the Taiwan Strait, and the Persian Gulf but also associated with a variety of Special Forces activities and stabilization operations. For today’s US military, which already excels at high technology and is increasingly focused on re-learning the lost art of counterinsurgency, this is first and foremost a question of finding the resources to field a large-enough standing Army and Marine Corps to handle personnelintensive missions such as the ones now under way in Iraq and Afghanistan. Let us hope there will be no such large-scale missions for a while. But preparing for the possibility, while doing whatever we can at this late hour to relieve the pressure on our soldiers and Marines in ongoing operations, is prudent. At worst, the only potential downside to a major program to strengthen the military is the possibility of spending a bit too much money. Recent history shows no link between having a larger military and its overuse; indeed, Ronald Reagan’s time in office was characterized by higher defense budgets and yet much less use of the military, an outcome for which we can hope in the coming years, but hardly guarantee. While the authors disagree between ourselves about proper increases in the size and cost of the military (with O’Hanlon preferring to hold defense to roughly 4 percent of GDP and seeing ground forces increase by a total of perhaps 100,000, and Kagan willing to devote at least 5 percent of GDP to defense as in the Reagan years and increase the Army by at least 250,000), we agree on the need to start expanding ground force capabilities by at least 25,000 a year immediately. Such a measure is not only prudent, it is also badly overdue.

Nuke war causes extinction.

Wickersham 10 Bill (University of Missouri adjunct professor of Peace Studies) “Threat of ‘nuclear winter’ remains New START treaty is step in right direction.” April 11th 2010 http://www.columbiatribune.com/news/2010/apr/11/threat-of-nuclear-winter-remains/

In addressing the environmental consequences of nuclear war, Columbian Steve Starr has written a summary of studies published by the Bulletin of the International Network of Engineers and Scientists Against Proliferation, which concludes: “U.S. **researchers have confirmed** the scientific validity of the concept of **‘nuclear winter’ and have demonstrated that** any conflict which targets **even a tiny fraction of the global arsenal will cause catastrophic disruptions of the global climate**.” In another statement on his Web site, Starr says: “**If 1% of the nuclear weapons** now ready for war **were detonated** in large cities, **they would utterly devastate the environment, climate, ecosystems and inhabitants of Earth. A war** fought with thousands of strategic nuclear weapons **would leave the Earth uninhabitable**.”

### 3-Employment DA

Living wage ordinances cause unemployment-this confirms earlier findings.

Neumark and Adams 5 David Neumark (Senior Fellow at the Public Policy Institute of California, Professor of Economics at Michigan State) and Scott Adams (Assistant Professor of Economics at University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee) “The Effects of Living Wage Laws: Evidence from Failed and Derailed Living Wage Campaigns” NBER WORKING PAPER SERIES 11342 May 2005 http://www.nber.org/papers/w11342 JW 2/27/15

The results confirm the findings of positive wage effects and negative employment effects of enacted living wages on low-wage, low-skill workers. In fact, the findings are generally very similar to the previous results using a broader control group. The evidence also suggests that there is no detectable impact of living wage campaigns themselves, apart from the legislation that results. The robustness of the findings to narrowing the control group to cities with failed or derailed living wage campaigns suggests that the more basic panel data research design recovers unbiased estimates of the effects of living wage laws. Recall that this seemed a particularly important question to explore in the context of living wages because others have argued that the rather large effects we have found may be partly attributable to the effects of campaigns; that is, some skepticism has been directed toward our estimates precisely on the basis of the type of argument we address in this paper. More generally, in empirical analyses of this type that identify effects of policies from variation in policies over geographical areas and time, there is a legitimate concern that the policy variation may be endogenous, so that apparent effects of the policy are in fact a reflection of changes that drove the policy variation, rather than the other way around. The robustness of the estimates of living wage effects that we find therefore suggests a couple of conclusions. First, the wage and employment effects we find are in fact not attributable to the effects of living wage campaigns, but rather to the effects of the laws themselves; in that sense, our analysis solidifies the existing findings. Nor are they likely attributable to endogeneity of the locations where living wage laws arise. Finally, in this particular context the reason we do not find a different answer using the control group of failed and derailed campaigns is that the usual toolkit applied in panel data contexts, including fixed city and year effects, and city-specific time trends, turns out to do enough to capture the important differences between the treatment and control group.24

Best methodology right here.

Neumark and Adams 5 David Neumark (Senior Fellow at the Public Policy Institute of California, Professor of Economics at Michigan State) and Scott Adams (Assistant Professor of Economics at University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee) “The Effects of Living Wage Laws: Evidence from Failed and Derailed Living Wage Campaigns” NBER WORKING PAPER SERIES 11342 May 2005 http://www.nber.org/papers/w11342 JW 2/27/15

Specifically, the cities with unsuccessful living wage campaigns offer three advantages relative to earlier research. First, these cities arguably provide a better control group for comparison with the cities that passed living wage laws, as underlying changes in low-wage labor markets that may have been associated with living wage laws are more likely to have been similar in cities where living wage campaigns arose. Second, the cities with failed or derailed living wage campaigns allow us to estimate the effects of living wages more directly, by netting out the possible consequences of changes that accompany living wage campaigns, stemming from influences such as increased organizing among lowwage workers and increased public focus on their conditions and wages. With respect to both of these points, it might be expected that smaller living wage effects on wages and employment would result, compared with evidence based on comparisons with the broader set of cities that simply did not pass living wage laws—irrespective of whether a living wage campaign occurred. And third, our approach yields estimates of the effects of living wage campaigns themselves.

Unemployment is worse for the poor than low wages.

ALEC 14 American Legislative Exchange Council. “Raising the Minimum Wage: The Effects on Employment, Businesses and Consumers.” March 2014. <http://www.alec.org/wp-content/uploads/Raising_Minimum_wage.pdf>

The problem plaguing America’s poor is not low wages, but rather a shortage of jobs.34 At a time when the nation’s workforce participation is only 62.8 percent, policymakers must avoid policies that destroy job opportunities.35 Increasing the minimum wage does nothing to help the unemployed poor. In fact, as discussed above, it hurts individuals looking for employment as it decreases available job opportunities. So, who is helped by an increase to the minimum wage? According to a 2012 report from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, although workers under age 25 represented only 20 percent of hourly wage earners, they made up just over half (50.6 percent) of all minimum wage earners.36 The average household income of these young minimum wage earners was $65,900.37 Among adults 25 and older earning the minimum wage, 75 percent live well above the poverty line of $22,350 for a family of four, with an average annual income of $42,500.38 This is possible because more than half of older minimum wage earners work part-time and many are not the sole earners in their households.39 In fact, 83.5 percent of employees whose wages would rise due to a minimum wage increase either live with parents or another relative, live alone, or are part of a dual-earner couple.40 Only 16.5 percent of individuals who would benefit from an increase to the minimum wage are sole earners in families with children.41 With national unemployment still hovering around 7 percent, national, state, and local demands for an increased minimum wage could not be more ill-timed.42 Increasing the minimum wage would make it more difficult for emerging businesses to expand payrolls and for existing businesses to maintain employees. Further, a higher wage rate would make it more difficult for individuals with less education and experience to find work. Raising the minimum wage favors those who already have jobs at the expense of the unemployed. Public policy would be more beneficial if it lowered barriers to entry for employment and increased economic opportunities. Raising the minimum wage may be a politically attractive policy option, but it is harmful to the very people policymakers intend it to help.

Unemployment causes lots of crime.

Raphael and Winter-Ebmer 98 “IDENTIFYING THE EFFECT OF UNEMPLOYMENT ON CRIME” Stephen Raphael and Rudolf Winter-Ebmer CEPR Discussion Paper No. 2129 1998 http://www.cepr.org/PRESS/DP2129.htm

Policies designed to increase jobs in inner city areas can have a direct, positive effect on crime rates. A new study of crime across the United States shows that crime rates rise and fall with unemployment. But this truth is obscured by other factors. A Discussion Paper published for the Centre for Economic Policy Research by two economists, Steven Raphael of the University of California at San Diego and Rudolf Winter-Ebmer of the University of Linz, finds support for the view held by most people that when men are out of a job they are more likely to steal because the risks seem more worthwhile. The writers find a significant positive, but also quantitatively large, impact of unemployment on several crime categories.

## Case

### A2 Systemic Harms First

Experts are right about their subject areas. Tetlock assumes subjects that experts are unfamiliar with. **Caplan 5** writes[[1]](#footnote-1)

Is my confidence in experts completely misplaced? I think not. **Tetlock**'s sample **suffers from** severe **selection bias**. **He deliberately asked** relatively **difficult and controversial questions**. As his methodological appendix explains, **questions had to "Pass the 'don't bother me** too often **with dumb questions' test." Dumb according to who?** The implicit answer is "Dumb according to **the typical expert** in the field." **What Tetlock really shows** is **that experts are overconfident if you exclude the questions where they have reached** a **solid consensus.** This is still an important finding. Experts really do make overconfident predictions about controversial questions. We have to stop doing that! However, this does not show that experts are overconfident about their core findings. It's particularly important to make this distinction because **Tetlock's work is so good that a lot of crackpots will want to highjack it:** "Experts are scarcely better than chimps, so why not give intelligent design and protectionism equal time?" But what **Tetlock** really **shows** is **that experts can raise** their **credibility if they stop overreaching**.

Any risk of extinction comes first.

**Bostrom 11** Nick Bostrom (Future of Humanity Institute, Oxford Martin School & Faculty of Philosophy, University of Oxford), “THE CONCEPT OF EXISTENTIAL RISK”, 2011 http://www.existential-risk.org/concept.html

Even if we use the most conservative of these estimates, which entirely ignores the possibility of space colonization and software minds, we find that **the expected loss of an existential catastrophe is greater than** the value of 1018 human lives.  This implies that the expected value of reducing existential risk by a mere one millionth of one percentage point is at least ten times the value of a billion human lives.  The more technologically comprehensive estimate of 1054 human-brain-emulation subjective life-years (or **1052 lives** of ordinary length) makes the same point even more starkly.  **Even if we give this** allegedly **lower bound** on the cumulative output potential of a technologically mature civilization **a mere 1% chance of being correct, we find that** the expected value of **reducing existential risk by a mere one billionth of one billionth of one percent**age point **is worth a hundred billion times** as much as **a billion human lives.**

### Turns

Living wage ordinances causes poverty; consensus of economists

Quigley 1 William Quigley, Law Professor-Loyola University New Orleans, 2001, "Full Time Workers Should Not Be Poor: The Living Wage Movement," Mississippi Law Journal, Spring, 70 Miss. J.J. 889, p. 935-6

Opponents of living wages argue that these ordinances could potentially increase the local poverty rate and cost too much. A survey of over 300 economists conducted in 2000 for the Employment Policies Institute, a nonprofit research organization generally opposed to raises in both the minimum wage and the enactment of living wage ordinances, found that nearly eight in ten of the labor economists surveyed thought living wage ordinances would result in employers hiring higher skilled workers, and over 70% said the laws could potentially reduce the number of entry-level jobs and thus increase the local poverty rate. [n180](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezp-prod1.hul.harvard.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.422568.3809552412&target=results_DocumentContent&returnToKey=20_T21059172089&parent=docview&rand=1417474365802&reloadEntirePage=true" \l "n180) The opposition also suggests that living wage ordinances increase the cost of governmental contracts. Pasadena, California, estimated their living wage ordinance cost to be about $ 200,000 for the year 2000; Cambridge, Massachusetts, estimated its cost at $ 300,000; Madison, Wisconsin, estimated its cost at $ 47,000. [n181](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezp-prod1.hul.harvard.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.422568.3809552412&target=results_DocumentContent&returnToKey=20_T21059172089&parent=docview&rand=1417474365802&reloadEntirePage=true" \l "n181) While there is certainly some cost associated with living wages, this article will not join in the aforementioned melee of economists. Others disagree. [n182](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezp-prod1.hul.harvard.edu/lnacui2api/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.422568.3809552412&target=results_DocumentContent&returnToKey=20_T21059172089&parent=docview&rand=1417474365802&reloadEntirePage=true" \l "n182)

Prefer expert consensus

**LaBossiere 14** Mike LaBossiere (blog contributor). “Picking between Experts.” Talking Philosophy. January 29th, 2014. http://blog.talkingphilosophy.com/?p=7755

3. The claims made by the expert are consistent with the views of the majority of qualified experts in the field. This is perhaps the most important factor. **As a general rule, a claim** that is **held as correct by the majority of qualified experts in the field is** the **most plausible** claim. The basic idea is that **the majority of experts are more likely to be right than those who disagree** with the majority. It is important to keep in mind that no field has complete agreement, so some degree of dispute is acceptable. How much is acceptable is, of course, a matter of serious debate. It is also important to be aware that the majority could turn out to be wrong. That said, the reason it is still reasonable for non-experts to go with the majority opinion is that non-experts are, by definition, not experts. After all, **if I am not an expert** in a field**, I would be hard pressed to justify picking the expert I happen to** like or **agree with against the view of the majority** of experts.

# 2NR

*[I read two new shells in the 2NR that were extemped]*

A. if debaters read AFC for a standard of act utilitarianism in the AC, they may not read a kritik of the negative’s impacts in the 1AR.

A. If debaters claim the negative may not read extinction impacts, then they may not read an impact of ontological annihilation.

1. Bryan Caplan (econ professor at George Mason). “Tackling Tetlock.” December 26th, 2005. <http://econlog.econlib.org/archives/2005/12/tackling_tetloc_1.html> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)